

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the office action dated August 10, 2006. Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that independent claims 9 and 18 include allowable subject matter.

Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al. (US 2002/0131370)

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al as herein amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments contained herein were not made to overcome the above rejection, rather the claim amendments have been introduced to clarify the subject matter of the invention.

The present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 10 are respectively, a method, and system for determining a relationship between the timing of a local clock of a node with respect to the timing of a local clock of at least one other node in a wireless communications network. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of recording at said node a request transmission time at which a clock information request message is to be transmitted. The amended claim 1 clarifies that a future clock value is recorded in the message, and the transmission of the message is postponed to that future clock value i.e. the clock information request message is transmitted at the recorded request transmission time (recorded future clock value), thereby ensuring that the said other node receives the exact time of transmission of clock information request message. Further, the amended claim 1 recites that the timing information

included in the response message includes response transmission time at which the response message has been transmitted, and it can be inferred that the timing information includes accurate clock value of the response transmission time. Similarly, claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the transmitter records a request transmission time at which a clock information request message is to be transmitted, and transmit the clock information request message from said node to said other node at the recorded request transmission time. Also, the amended claim 10 recites that the receiver transmits a response message including response transmission time at which other node transmitted the response message. No new matter is added by these amendments, and adequate support is found in Paragraph Nos. [0023] and [0025] of the Applicant's original specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chuah et al does not anticipate the invention recited in amended claim 1 and claim 10. Chuah et al does not anticipate the step of "recording the request transmission time at which the clock information request message is to be transmitted and transmitting the clock information request message at the recorded request transmission time". Further, Chuah et al does not anticipate the response transmission time at which said other node transmitted the response message. As Chuah et al specifies in [0014], "*the receiver puts another time stamp T_i^2 immediately before sending the message*". The word "immediately" specified in Chuah et al reveals that the time stamp included in the message is close, but not equal with the time when the message is transmitted, whereas it can be inferred from the amended claim 1 and 10, that the response transmission time included inside the response message is exactly equal with the time, the response message is transmitted. In general, the present invention ensures that 'a transmission time' included inside a message is exactly equal to the value of the clock when the transmission of the message starts.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chuah et al to extend the concept of “clock synchronization” to the teaching of the ad-hoc peer-to-peer wireless network, because as required by claim 1 and 10, the clock information request message is needed to be transmitted at the recorded request transmission time, and the response message is needed to be transmitted at the response transmission time, and as such there is no mentioning of transmitting the message at the recorded time.

Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are allowable over Chuah et al based on their dependencies upon claim 1 which claim was shown to be allowable. Similarly, claims 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are allowable over Chuah et al based on their dependencies upon claim 10 which claim was shown to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 2 through to 8 and claims 11 through to 17 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 2 through to 8 and claims 11 through to 17 may now be passed to allowance.

Other Amendments to the Claims and Specification

Applicant has amended claims 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18 to correct minor informalities. Further, the specification has been amended to update the status of referenced patents and patent applications. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

November 9, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/
Randi L. Karpinia
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 46,148
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com